DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 973 CE 066 448

AUTHOR	Burrell, Lewis P.
TITLE	A Study of the Preparation of Vocational Teachers for Teaching Mainstreamed At-Risk Special Needs Students.
SPONS AGENCY	Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
PUB DATE	Dec 93
CONTRACT	ODE92-PD-0002
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention (Nashville, TN, December 1993).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Needs; *High Risk Students; *Mainstreaming; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Special Needs Students; State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	Ohio

ABSTRACT

A study examined the preparedness of vocational teachers for teaching mainstreamed at-risk special needs learners. A 46-item survey designed to measure perceptions of vocational teacher preparation pertinent to special needs learning factors was mailed to a random statewide sample of 1,100 Ohio vocational education teachers, vocational special education coordinators, vocational special needs evaluators, and state supervisory staff. A total of 331 persons (approximately 30%) completed the survey instrument. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of and need for training in the following aspects of the instructional process: assessment and evaluation, counseling and referral, program placement, remediation, tutoring, specialized service, job placement, and follow-up. The survey confirmed that educators consider training in all eight aspects of the instructional process more important and more necessary for teachers working with mainstreamed at-risk special needs students than for teachers working with typical vocational students. Significant differences on all eight items of the importance of training scale and on six items of the need for training scale were found across the variables for educator type. (Appendixes include the Kent State University mainstreaming model for vocational education special needs services, the survey instrument, and tables detailing selected study findings.) Contains 20 references. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 973

A Study Of The Preparation Of Vocational Teachers For Teaching Mainstreamed At-Risk Special Needs Students

Ohio North East Regional Vocational Education Personnel Center
Contract No. ODE92-PD-0002
Center Grant Number 440142

by

Lewis P. Burrell, Ed.D.

Kent State University
300 White Hall
Kent, Ohio 44242
(216) 672-2656

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Burrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Presentation at the
Trade and Industrial Education Research Forum
1993 American Vocational Association Convention
Nashville, Tennessee
December 3-7, 1993

CE066148

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE PREPARATION OF VOCATIONAL TEACHERS FOR TEACHING MAINSTREAMED AT-RISK SPECIAL NEEDS LEARNER

The study was designed to determine whether or not an important in-service training need existed in the vocational support service areas for those educators who teach vocational classes which include both the typical and the mainstreamed at-risk special needs students. Vocational education teachers, vocational special education coordinators, vocational special needs evaluators, and Ohio state supervisory staff (N=331) completed a 46-item Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) survey instrument designed to measure their perceptions on vocational teacher preparation pertinent to special needs learning factors. (N=331) To examine the demographic background variables and the dependent measures, the one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. t-tests proved that educators view all of eight special needs service area factors differently between the VOED and SPED student groups. The respondents placed a higher emphasis on the mainstreamed SPED students than on the typical VOED students on the eight factors. An analysis of the VETN scale by the demographic variable of Educator Type showed significant differences ($p=<.05$) on eight items of the VETN **Importance-Of-Training** and on six items of the VETN **Need-For-Training** across the variables for Educator Type -- teacher, coordinator, evaluator, and administrator.

PROPOSAL

TITLE: A Study Of The Preparation Of Vocational Teachers For Teaching Mainstreamed At-Risk Special Needs Students.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES: The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not an important in-service training need existed in eight vocational support service areas for those educators who teach vocational classes with both the typical and the mainstreamed at-risk special needs students.

The objectives of the study were defined as follows:

1. To determine whether a training need existed in the preparation of vocational teachers, based on whether any differences existed in the perceived Importance-Of-Training across eight special needs factors by four educator types.
2. To determine whether a training need existed in the preparation of vocational teachers, based on whether any differences existed in the perceived Need-For-Training across eight special needs factors by four educator types.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The research was designed to examine vocational educators' perceptions of the Importance-Of-Training and the Need-For-Training in vocational classes with typical vocational education students and mainstreamed special needs students. A 46-item Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) survey instrument was designed to measure the perceptions of pertinent special needs learning factors. The instrument was administered to a state-wide

sample in Ohio which included vocational education teachers, vocational special education coordinators, vocational special needs evaluators, and Ohio state supervisory staff administrators. The questions of the VETN instrument are included as APPENDIX B. The state-wide study describes the results of the VETN Likert-type scale, a measure designed to assess the degree to which the vocational educators perceive the Importance-Of-Training and the Need-For-Training for both the typical and the mainstreamed special needs vocational students. The instrument assessed the vocational educators' perceived importance-of-training and need-for-training in three major areas: pre-program, program, and post-program. The three major program areas of the study included eight sub-scale factors: Assessment and Evaluation, Counseling and Referral, Program Placement, Remediation, Tutoring, Specialized Service, Job Placement, and Follow-Up.

The Sample.

The VETN instrument was randomly mailed to 1100 subjects state-wide. A total of 331 subjects participated in this study (N=33-1). Of the total, 174 were male and 153 were female. The ages ranged from 21 to 63 (M=42.5). By race, 288 were caucasian and 5 were black.

The Procedure.

A demographic questionnaire and a VETN instrument (1,100) were mailed state-wide to vocational and special needs educators who work with mainstreamed vocational education students. The response rate for this sample was approximately 30 percent, a

fairly good return for a survey of this type. The sample appears to represent the target population, to which the results of these analyses can be generalized.

The Instrument.

An instrument, Vocational Education Training Need (VETN) (Burrell, 1989) was designed to measure the vocational educator's perceived Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training between the typical vocational education (VOED) and the mainstreamed at-risk special needs (SPED) students in the vocational school setting. The instrument consisted of forty-six (46) Likert-type items on a 5-point scale for both Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training. The survey instrument addressed two major areas of concern of vocational educators: a) the way vocational teachers view the Importance-Of-Training and, b) the way vocational teachers view their Need-For-Training when teaching a class mix of mainstreamed at-risk and regular typical vocational students. The reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) for Importance-Of-Training measures for VOED students and SPED students, and Need-For-Training for VOED and SPED students were .97, .97, .98, and .98 respectively. This measure was found to be reliable and valid. Each factor had four dimensions (Importance-Of-Training for VOED and SPED students, and Need-For-Training for VOED and SPED students).

Additional Data.

Mean score comparisons have been presented from the VETN instrument in order for program planners to determine the degree to

which each group within the population responded on each item.

RESULTS:

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) was used for the statistical analyses. In order to test the hypotheses to determine whether a difference existed between the two groups, t-tests were computed. In order to examine the demographic background variables and the dependent measures, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. In appropriate cases, the Newman-Keuls and Scheffe, a posteriori and the Pearson product-moment correlation tests were used. The study reported the test reliability and validity for the VETN scale: the total VETN scale, the three major program area scales, and the eight factor sub-scales were found to be reliable and valid. The results of the study indicated significant differences in both the perception of Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training between the typical vocational education (VOED) and the mainstreamed special needs (SPED) students in the three program areas and across the eight factors listed above. The results were perceived as being more weighted toward the mainstreamed at-risk students than the typical vocational students on the dependent measures. The relationships between the VETN scale and the demographic background variable of Educator Type were compared.

CONCLUSIONS:

The dependent measures of the eight special needs service factors sub-scales, the three major program area clusters, and the total VETN scale were treated across fourteen background variables.

Each factor in the analysis had four dimensions: Importance and Need-For-Training comparisons for VOED and SPED students. The reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) for Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training measures for VOED and SPED students with the VETN proved reliable and valid. The t-tests proved that educators tend to view the eight special needs services factors differently between the VOED and SPED groups. A higher emphasis was placed on the mainstreamed at-risk SPED students than on the typical VOED students in the eight factor groups. The t-tests also proved that educators perceive a difference in Importance-Of and Need-For-Training in the pre-program, program, and post-program groups. In the analysis of the total scores cluster, the Need-For-Training for the two groups were perceived significantly different.

An Item analysis of the VETN scale by the demographic variable of Educator Type (Table 1a) showed significant differences on items of **Importance-Of-Training** as follows: **In VOED**, evaluating the VOED laboratory, evaluating the related class, developing youth organizations, visiting with families, and applying a variety of techniques; **In SPED**, interpreting test data, following up the graduates, developing youth organizations, and guiding tutorial services. **The Item analysis of the VETN scale by Educator Type** (Table 1b) showed significant differences on items of **Need-For-Training** as follows: **In VOED**, relating math and science, developing youth organizations, developing communication skills, visiting with families, and managing the IEP; **In SPED**, evaluating the

VOED laboratory, developing youth organizations, and visiting with families.

The VETN mean rating scores were listed in Table 2 by Educator Type for the test items with significant differences for the Importance-Of-Training variable and in Table 3 for the Need-For-Training variable. Program planners may access these statistics for a better understanding in the provision of inservice and service training. (The total VETN item list is included as APPENDIX B)

Table 1.
VETN AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BY EDUCATOR TYPE

No.	Description	Importance-Of-Training		Need-For-Training	
		VOED	SPED	VOED	SPED
4	Evaluating the VOED lab	p<.02			p<.05
6	Evaluating related class		p<.05		
7	Interpreting test data		p<.05		
12	Relating math and science				p<.04
13	Following up graduates		p<.05		
17	Developing youth organization	p<.009	p<.003	p<.0003	p<.0001
18	Develop. communication skills				p<.03
26	Guiding tutorial services		p<.01		
31	Visiting with families	p<.002	p<.03	p<.0009	p<.02
42	Managing the IEP				p<.01
43	Applying variety in teaching	p<.008			

Table 2.
VETN MEAN RATING SCORES BY EDUCATOR TYPE IN IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING BY: (TEACHER, COORDINATOR, EVALUATOR, ADMINISTRATOR)

VETN No.	VOED Mean	SPED Mean
4	(3.83, 3.88, 3.73, 4.24)	
6	(3.59, 3.84, 3.36, 4.36)	
7		(3.77, 3.88, 4.33, 4.04)
13		(3.62, 4.10, 4.12, 4.18)
17	(3.62, 3.24, 3.30, 4.39)	(3.75, 3.45, 3.33, 4.50)
26		(3.79, 4.31, 4.27, 4.00)
31	(3.55, 3.61, 3.27, 4.21)	(3.80, 3.88, 3.12, 4.32)
43	(3.82, 4.16, 4.18, 4.61)	

Table 3.
VETN MEAN RATING SCORES BY EDUCATOR TYPE IN NEED-FOR-TRAINING BY: (TEACHER, COORDINATOR, EVALUATOR, ADMINISTRATOR)

VETN No.	VOED Mean	SPED Mean
4		(3.67, 3.69, 3.61, 4.07)
12	(3.38, 3.16, 3.55, 4.11)	
17	(2.80, 2.65, 2.64, 3.93)	(3.08, 2.98, 2.76, 4.19)
18	(2.98, 3.22, 3.42, 3.96)	
31	(2.86, 2.76, 2.76, 3.68)	(3.16, 3.02, 3.00, 3.75)
42	(3.15, 2.55, 2.70, 3.29)	

IMPLICATIONS:

1. In terms of the eight special needs service factors, a plan needs to be devised to bring about more uniformity when dealing with the Importance-Of-Training and Need-For-Training in the special needs service areas which deal with the typical vocational education students and the at-risk special needs students who are mainstreamed into vocational education programs.
2. According to the results of the program cluster analysis, the importance of training vocational teachers who teach mainstreamed at-risk special needs students in vocational education was stressed by vocational state staff; therefore, vocational education program planners should review the available support resource services, the facilities, and the intervention programs with vocational and special education specialists to more appropriately provide support service options to mainstreamed students in the vocational education programs.
3. In view of the findings from this study, which revealed significant differences in the perceived Importance and Need-For-Training within the three program areas (Pre-program, Program and

Post-program), inservice training should be held for teachers in those areas significant to this study and which relate directly to student learning outcomes.

FURTHER RESEARCH:

The research findings above could lead to further investigations as follows:

1. Further comparative analyses need to be conducted on other independent variables (such as the Options programs) in order to understand how other independent variables might relate to special needs services.
2. Further analysis could be made to compare similar type school districts with varying types of special needs support services and schools with diverse populations of at-risk students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Abbreviated)

Alabama State Dept. of Education. (1987). All You Ever Wanted to Know About Special Needs But Didn't Know Who to Ask. Special Needs Handbook. Montgomery: Alabama State Dept. of Education, Division of Vocational Education Services.

Albright, L. (1986). Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped. A Guide to Program Administration. Alexandria, VA: American Vocational Association.

Asselin, S. (1987). Making the transition: A teacher's guide for helping students with special needs. Alexandria, VA: American Vocational Association.

Brolin, D.E. (1982). Vocational Preparation of Persons with Handicaps. 2nd ed. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Cobb, R.B. (1987). Educating the handicapped to enter the world of work. PRISE Reporter, Sept., 1989.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L. (1987). Mainstream Assistance Teams to Accommodate Difficult-to-Teach Students in General Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education.

Hamilton, J. (1987). Handbook on Mainstreaming Handicapped Students in Vocational Education. Westerville, OH: Ohio State Council on Vocational Education.

Institute for the Study of Family, Work, and Community. Improving the options of handicapped students in mainstream vocational education. Final report. Berkeley.

Lawless, K. (1986). Neediest of the needy: Special education for migrants. Harvesting the harvesters. Book 8. Potsdam: State University of New York.

Meers, G. (1987). Handbook of Vocational Special Needs Education. Rockville, MD: Aspen Publisher, Inc.

Missouri State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (1987). Building Trades. Carpentry, Electrical Wiring,Plumbing. Columbia: Missouri University, Instructional Materials Lab.

Morley, R. et al (1987). Strategies for teaching handicapped students in industrial technology. Des Moines: Iowa State Dept. of Education.

McDaid, J. (1987). Special education annual program evaluation. Evaluation Department Report No. 473. San Diego Schools, CA: Planning, Research and Evaluation Division.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (1987). Research on the effectiveness of mainstreaming. Abstract XIV: Research & resources on special education.

Ohio Department of Education, (1977). Rules for the Education of Handicapped Children, Columbus, OH.

Pennsylvania State University, Dept. of Agricultural and Extension Education. (1986). Enhancement of pedagogical abilities of vocational teachers to serve handicapped students in regular CBVE programs - Year 2. Final report. Teacher Education Research Series, 27:1.

Salend, S. (1983). Mainstreaming: Sharpening up follow-up. Academic Therapy, 18:3, 299-304.

Sarkees, M.D. and Scott, J.L. (1985). Vocational Special Needs, 2nd Ed. American Technical Publishers.

Wilkes, H., Bireley, M., & Schultz, J. (1979). Criteria for mainstreaming the learning disabled child into the regular classroom. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12:4, 46-51.

Wircenski, J. (1986). Providing support services to disadv. youth and adults in vo ed. Paper presented at AVA Conven.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX A

MAINSTREAMED MODEL FOR

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SPECIAL NEEDS SERVICES

Typical Students — Mainstreamed Students

PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

COUNSELING AND REFERRAL

PROGRAM PLACEMENT

PROGRAM SERVICES

REMEDIATION

TUTORING

SPECIALIZED SERVICE

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

JOB PLACEMENT

FOLLOW-UP

***Total Enrollment**

146,711 Typical Students

***Total Enrollment**

25,419 Disabled Students

74,712 Disadvantaged Students

***TOTAL VOCATIONAL ENROLLMENT IN OHIO SCHOOLS: 246,842 (1992 Enrollment Figures)**

APPENDIX B

AT-RISK SPECIAL NEEDS SURVEY BY: THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING NEED (VETN) INSTRUMENT

AREAS SURVEYED WITH REGARD TO AT-RISK SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS

Are vocational teachers prepared to:

1. Define the VOED curriculum?
2. Adjust the VOED curriculum?
3. Manage the VOED laboratory?
4. Evaluate the VOED laboratory?
5. Manage the related class?
6. Evaluate the related class?
7. Interpret test results on students?
8. Use appropriate instructional procedures in teaching?
9. Select VOED instructional materials appropriately?
10. Modify VOED instructional materials appropriately?
11. Place students in jobs in the community?
12. Relate math and science concepts to vocational practice?
13. Follow-up on program graduates?
14. Motivate students?
15. Insure appropriate safety practices?
16. Grade student work appropriately?
17. Develop youth organizational standards?
18. Develop appropriate communication skills?
19. Control student behaviors?
20. Manage student behaviors?
21. Enhance community involvement skills?
22. Maintain high standards of vocational performance?
23. Process the appropriate paper work and records?
24. Develop instructional goals and objectives?
25. Adjust the instruction to the learning styles?
26. Guide the tutorial services?
27. Obtain community services?
28. Offer vocational and personal advice?
29. Provide an appropriate learning environment?
30. Obtain school related support services?
31. Visit with the families?
32. Test the student performance?
33. Evaluate the vocational achievement records?
34. Develop appropriate vocational goals and objectives?
35. Identify school personnel to accept and work with?
36. Help the families accept the vocational goals?
37. Recruit by using information on the student assessment?
38. Interpret data on student records?
39. Confer with other professionals about the programs?
40. Communicate with the families?
41. Understand the teacher liabilities in working with?
42. Manage individualized education program(s) of learning?
43. Apply a variety of learning and teaching techniques?
44. Develop behavioral objectives?
45. Develop the instruction to the individualized differences?
46. Facilitate cooperative relationships on behalf of?

A Likert-type scale from 1 to 5 was used to determine the degree to which the subjects perceived both the importance-of-training and the need-for-training for vocational teachers who are teaching the at-risk special needs students.

Importance Scale:	Need-For-Training Scale:
1 - No Importance	1 - No Need
2 - Little Importance	2 - Little Need
3 - Some Importance	3 - Some Need
4 - Considerable Importance	4 - Considerable Need
5 - Great Importance	5 - Great Need

The questions of the survey were rated by Importance and Need by the following subjects: vocational teachers, vocational special needs coordinators, vocational special needs evaluators, and program/state department administrators (Ohio).

APPENDIX D

Table 20.
RANK ORDER OF MEAN SCORES ON IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF SPED STUDENTS

RANK	VETN NO.	DEFINITION	SPED MEAN
1	14.	Motivating students	4.48
2	15.	Insuring appropriate safety	4.44
3	43.	Applying variety to techniques	4.42
4	18.	Developing communication skills	4.39
5	25.	Adjusting to learning styles	4.39
6	29.	Providing learning environment	4.33
7	41.	Understanding liabilities	4.32
8	8.	Using appropriate instruction	4.27
9	9.	Selecting VOED materials	4.24
10	19.	Controlling student behavior	4.24
11	11.	Placing students in community jobs	4.22
12	22.	Maintaining high standards	4.22
13	45.	Instructing to individual differences	4.22
14	20.	Managing student behavior	4.21
15	32.	Testing performance	4.18
16	16.	Grading student work	4.17
17	30.	Obtaining school related support	4.17
18	34.	Developing vocational goals	4.17
19	46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	4.17
20	1.	Define VOED curriculum	4.15
21	4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	4.15
22	10.	Modifying VOED instruction	4.15
23	40.	Communicating with families	4.15
24	24.	Developing goals and objectives	4.14
25	3.	Managing VOED laboratory	4.13
26	12.	Relating math and science	4.12
27	42.	Managing the IEP	4.11
28	2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	4.10
29	5.	Managing related class	4.10
30	44.	Developing behavioral objectives	4.10
31	28.	Offering advice	4.06
32	6.	Evaluating related class	4.03
33	37.	Recruiting through assessment	4.02
34	21.	Enhancing community involvement	4.01
35	39.	Conferring with professionals	3.99
36	36.	Helping families with goals	3.97
37	7.	Interpreting test data	3.93
38	31.	Visiting with families	3.93
39	26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.92
40	27.	Obtaining community services	3.90
41	35.	Identifying school personnel	3.90
42	33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.82
43	38.	Interpreting student records	3.80
44	13.	Following-up graduates	3.75
45	23.	Processing appropriate records	3.72
46	17.	Developing youth organizations	3.66

Scale: 1-no(importance); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; and 5-great
N=331

APPENDIX E

Table 22.
RANK ORDER OF MEAN SCORES ON NEED-FOR-TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF SPED STUDENTS

RANK		DEFINITION	SPED MEAN
1	14.	Motivating students	3.99
2	25.	Adjusting to learning styles	3.89
3	41.	Understanding liabilities	3.89
4	43.	Applying variety to techniques	3.83
5	18.	Developing communication skills	3.80
6	10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.78
7	45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.77
8	8.	Using appropriate instruction	3.76
9	9.	Selecting VOED materials	3.71
10	11.	Placing students in community jobs	3.69
11	12.	Relating math and science	3.68
12	2.	Adjusting the VOED curriculum	3.66
13	42.	Managing the IEP	3.63
14	3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.60
15	4.	Evaluating the VOED laboratory	3.60
16	19.	Controlling student behavior	3.58
17	20.	Managing student behavior	3.57
18	6.	Evaluating the related classes	3.56
19	44.	Developing behavioral objectives	3.56
20	15.	Insuring appropriate safety	3.55
21	5.	Managing related classes	3.52
22	7.	Interpreting test data	3.51
23	29.	Providing appropriate learning	3.51
24	22.	Maintaining high standards	3.50
25	27.	Obtaining community services	3.49
26	32.	Testing performance	3.49
27	21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.47
28	16.	Grading student work	3.46
29	46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.46
30	24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.45
31	34.	Developing vocational goals	3.45
32	37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.44
33	30.	Obtaining school related support	3.43
34	1.	Defining VOED curriculum	3.41
35	26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.41
36	28.	Offering advice	3.39
37	39.	Conferring with professionals	3.35
38	36.	Helping families with goals	3.33
39	40.	Communicating with families	3.27
40	35.	Identifying school personnel	3.26
41	38.	Interpreting student records	3.25
42	33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.19
43	31.	Visiting with families	3.11
44	17.	Developing youth organizations	3.08
45	23.	Processing appropriate records	3.04
46	13.	Following-up on graduates	3.03

Scale: 1-no(need); 2-little; 3-some; 4-considerable; and 5-great N=331

APPENDIX F

Table 24.
CATEGORICAL LIST OF IMPORTANCE-OF-TRAINING MEAN SCORES BY THE THREE MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS AND THE EIGHT FACTORS

Number	Definition	Importance-Of-Training VOED MEAN	SPED MEAN
PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Assessment and Evaluation		
7.	Interpreting test data	3.51	3.93
30.	Obtaining school related support	3.91	4.17
32.	Testing performance	4.04	4.18
33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.70	3.82
38.	Interpreting student records	3.61	3.80
	Counseling and Referral		
23.	Processing appropriate records	3.54	3.72
28.	Offering advice	3.96	4.06
37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.83	4.02
	Program Placement		
1.	Defining VOED curriculum	4.01	4.15
29.	Providing learning environment	4.22	4.33
34.	Developing vocational goals	4.02	4.17
35.	Identifying school personnel	3.67	3.90
39.	Conferring with professionals	3.74	3.99
41.	Understanding liabilities	4.19	4.32
PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Remediation		
3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.82	4.13
9.	Selecting VOED materials	4.02	4.24
	Tutoring		
5.	Managing related class	3.80	4.10
8.	Using appropriate instruction	4.07	4.27
12.	Relating math and science	4.06	4.12
15.	Insuring appropriate safety	4.34	4.44
17.	Developing youth organizations	3.58	3.66
22.	Maintaining high standards	4.28	4.22
	Specialized Service		
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	3.58	4.10
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.90	4.15
6.	Evaluating related classes	3.77	4.03
10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.57	4.15
14.	Motivating students	4.45	4.48
16.	Grading student work	3.97	4.17
18.	Developing communication skills	4.24	4.39
19.	Controlling student behavior	4.15	4.24
20.	Managing student behavior	4.12	4.21
24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.93	4.14
25.	Adjusting to learning styles	4.08	4.39
26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.44	3.92
42.	Managing the IEP	3.44	4.11
43.	Applying variety to techniques	4.29	4.42
44.	Developing behaviorial objectives	3.89	4.10
45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.95	4.22

Table 24, Cont'd--

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

	Job Placement		
21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.92	4.01
27.	Obtaining community serivces	3.64	3.90
46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.99	4.17
	Follow-Up		
11.	Placing students in community jobs	4.11	4.22
13.	Follow-up of graduates	3.66	3.75
31.	Visiting with families	3.75	3.93
36.	Helping families with goals	3.79	3.97
40.	Communicating with families	3.99	4.15

Mean Scale: 1-No importance
2-Little importance
3-Some importance
4-Considerable importance
5-Great importance

N=331

APPENDIX G

Table 25.
CATEGORICAL LIST OF NEED-FOR-TRAINING MEAN SCORES BY THREE MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS AND EIGHT FACTORS

Number	Definition	Need-For-Training VOED MEAN	SPED MEAN
PRE-PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Assessment and Evaluation		
7.	Interpreting test data	3.12	3.51
30.	Obtaining school related support	3.14	4.43
32.	Testing performance	3.15	3.49
33.	Evaluating achievement records	3.01	3.19
38.	Interpreting student records	2.99	3.25
	Counseling and Referral		
23.	Processing appropriate records	2.77	3.04
28.	Offering advice	3.22	3.39
37.	Recruiting through assessment	3.27	3.44
	Program Placement		
1.	Defining VOED curriculum	2.92	3.41
29.	Providing learning environment	3.28	3.51
34.	Developing vocational goals	3.17	3.45
35.	Identifying school personnel	2.99	3.26
39.	Conferring with professionals	3.10	3.35
41.	Understanding liabilities	3.74	3.89
PROGRAM SERVICES			
	Remediation		
3.	Managing the VOED laboratory	3.05	3.60
9.	Selecting VOED materials	3.24	3.71
	Tutoring		
5.	Managing related class	2.97	3.52
8.	Using appropriate instruction	3.27	3.76
12.	Relating math and science	3.48	3.68
15.	Insuring appropriate safety	3.34	3.55
17.	Developing youth organizations	2.90	3.08
22.	Maintaining high standards	3.37	3.50
	Specialized Service		
2.	Adjusting VOED curriculum	2.91	3.66
4.	Evaluating VOED laboratory	3.06	3.60
6.	Evaluating related classes	2.96	3.56
10.	Modifying VOED instruction	3.09	3.78
14.	Motivating students	3.89	3.99
16.	Grading student work	3.00	3.46
18.	Developing communication skills	3.50	3.80
19.	Controlling student behavior	3.38	3.58
20.	Managing student behavior	3.38	3.57
24.	Developing goals and objectives	3.10	3.45
25.	Adjusting to learning styles	3.45	3.89
26.	Guiding tutorial services	3.00	3.41
42.	Managing the IEP	3.02	3.63
43.	Applying variety to techniques	3.55	3.83
44.	Developing behaviorial objectives	3.24	3.56
45.	Instructing to individual differences	3.44	3.77

Table 25, Cont'd--

POST-PROGRAM SERVICES

	Job Placement		
21.	Enhancing community involvement	3.33	3.47
27.	Obtaining community serivces	3.20	3.49
46.	Facilitating cooperative relationships	3.27	3.46
	Follow-Up		
11.	Placing students in community jobs	3.29	3.69
13.	Follow-up of graduates	2.86	3.03
31.	Visiting with families	2.92	3.11
36.	Helping families with goals	3.08	3.33
40.	Communicating with families	3.10	3.27

Mean Scale: 1-No importance
2-Little importance
3-Some importance
4-Considerable importance
5-Great importance

N=331